Remarks

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Previously presented claims 1-20 remain pending in the application. Claims 1 and 20 are independent. The rejections are respectfully submitted to be obviated in view of the remarks presented herein.

The objection to the disclosure is respectfully traversed. In Applicants' Amendment filed July 17, 2008, specification pages 1 and 2 were amended to delete the reference to claim 1. (See pages 2 and 3 of the July 17 Amendment.) Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the disclosure are respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Anazawa and Saaski

Claims 1-4, 7-10, 15-17, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 02/24320 of Anazawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,238,325 to Anazawa et al., hereinafter "Anazawa") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,660,728 to Saaski et al. ("Saaski"). The examiner acknowledges that "Anazawa does not disclose the member is made of an injection molding technique" (Office Action page 4, numbered paragraph 9). To rectify the deficiency of Anazawa, the examiner asserts that Saaski discloses "a fluid handling device for handling continuous fluid flow rates

in a device that comprises of a substrate made of a durable material in which the channel and cavities are made of such as molding (see abstract, column 24, lines 56-64)" (Office Action page 4, numbered paragraph 9).

The rejection of claims 1-4, 7-10, 15-17, and 20 based on Anazawa and Saaski is respectfully traversed. For at least the following reasons, the combined disclosures of Anazawa and Saaski would not have rendered obvious Applicants' claimed invention.

Previously presented claim 1 defines a cassette that includes, *inter alia*, the feature of "at least one of the first part and the second part having a construction that includes a rigid material with a flexible material region associated therewith, with the rigid material and the flexible material region being of a one piece, *two-component injection molded construction*."

The combined disclosures of Anazawa and Saaski do not teach all of Applicants' claim features. Anazawa is deficient for at least the reasons acknowledged by the examiner. Saaski, which is directed to a "*Micromachined* Fluid Handling Apparatus With Filter," fails to teach Applicants' claimed feature of "the rigid material and the flexible material region being of a one piece, *two-component injection molded construction*." In describing the fabrication of "micromachined" regulator 32, Saaski discloses that

> [t]he substrate 34 may be manufactured from any suitable strong, durable material which is compatible with the medication 12, and in which the inlet channels 38, the inlet cavity 40, the regulator seat 42, the outlet cavity 52, and the outlet port 54 may be manufactured in any suitable way, such as by using any suitable etching, molding, stamping and machining process (column 24, lines 56-62).

However, Saaski's "molding" is certainly not injection molding, let alone Applicants' claimed feature of "a *one piece, two-component injection molded* construction."

And, as further evidence that the disclosure of Saaski is not pertinent, Saaski discloses at column 25, lines 16-41, how "[t]he substrate 34 and the membrane 36 may be *assembled* together." More specifically, at column 25, lines 16-23, Saaski teaches that

> [t]he substrate 34 and the membrane 36 may be *assembled* together in any suitable leak-proof way. Alternatively, the substrate 34 and the membrane 36 may be *bonded* together in any suitable leak-proof way, such as by *anodically bonding* them together; such as by *fusing* them together (as by the use of heat or ultrasonic welding); and such as by using any suitable *bonding materials*, such as adhesive, glue, epoxy, solvents, glass solder, and metal solder. (Emphasis added)

That is not Applicants' claimed invention. The above-quoted disclosure from Saaski describes various options for the *subsequent* joining of two pieces (i.e., the substrate 34 and the membrane 36) that are *first* fabricated as *separate* pieces. Therefore, Saaski's teaching is very different from Applicants' claimed "one piece, two-component injection molded construction."

Furthermore, there is simply no teaching in Anazawa and Saaski that would have led one to select the references and combine them, let alone in a way that would produce the invention defined by Applicants' claim 1.

Therefore, the combined disclosures of Anazawa and Saaski would not have rendered obvious the invention defined by claim 1. Claims 2-4, 7-10, and 15-17 are allowable because they depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1, and for the subject matter recited therein. Independent claim 20 is allowable for reasons similar to those presented for claim 1.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Anazawa, Saaski, and Karp

Claims 5, 6, 11-14, 18, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anazawa and Saaski, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. US 2002/0081222 of Karp.

The rejection of claims 5, 6, 11-14, 18, and 19 based on Anazawa, Saaski, and Karp is similarly traversed. Claims 5, 6, 11-14, 18, and 19 all depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1. Claim 1 is allowable for at least the reasons explained above. Regardless of what Karp may disclose with regard to a membrane pump, that teaching alone adds nothing that would rectify any of the above-described deficiencies of the asserted Anazawa/Saaski combination. Accordingly, claims 5, 6, 11-14, 18, and 19

are allowable because they depend from claim 1, and for the subject matter recited therein.

In view of the foregoing, this application is now in condition for allowance. If the examiner believes that an interview might expedite prosecution, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC

By: Harvey B. Jacobson, Jr.
Harvey B. Jacobson, Jr.
Reg. No. 20,851

400 Seventh Street, N. W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: (202) 638-6666
Date: May 12, 2009